

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/612,747	07/02/2003	James E. Wagner	2002B092/2	5545		
23455	7590 10/06/2004		EXAM	EXAMINER		
	DBIL CHEMICAL CO	TESKIN,	TESKIN, FRED M			
P O BOX 2149 BAYTOWN, TX 77522-2149			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
,			1713			
			DATE MAILED: 10/06/2004			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

				I				
Office Action Summary		Application No.	lication No. Applicant(s)					
		10/612,747		WAGNER ET AL.				
		Examiner		Art Unit				
		Fred M Teskin		1713				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	pears on the cover	rsheet with the c	orrespondence add	dress			
A SH THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. e period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period v ure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, howe y within the statutory mir will apply and will expire e, cause the application to	ever, may a reply be tim nimum of thirty (30) days SIX (6) MONTHS from to become ABANDONEI	nely filed s will be considered timely the mailing date of this co D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status								
1)[Responsive to communication(s) filed on	<u>_</u> .						
2a)□	☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.							
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposit	ion of Claims							
5)⊠ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) <u>1-51</u> is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) <u>1-13,16-37 and 40-49</u> is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>14,15,38,39,50 and 51</u> is/are rejected Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consider d.						
Applicat	ion Papers							
9)[The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.						
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc	cepted or b) ob	jected to by the f	Examiner.				
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held	in abeyance. See	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
11)□	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	·						
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been rece ts have been rece rity documents ha u (PCT Rule 17.2	eived. eived in Applicati ave been receive 2(a)).	ion No ed in this National	Stage			
Attachmer	nt(s)							
	ce of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲	Interview Summary	(PTO-413)				
2) Notice	ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	-, —	Paper No(s)/Mail Da	ate	152)			
	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) er No(s)/Mail Date <u>070203</u> .	5) <u> </u> 6) <u> </u>	Other:	Patent Application (PTC	J-102)			

Application/Control Number: 10/612,747

Art Unit: 1713

Claims 1-51 are currently pending and under examination herein.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 14, 15, 38, 39, 50 and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over either of US 5739266 to Piana and US 6147167 to Mack et al.

Claims 14 and 15 are respectively drawn to a polyethylene resin formed by the process of claim 1 and a polyethylene film comprising the resin thus formed.

More specifically, the claimed polyethylene resin is formed by conveying the resin downstream through a melt-mixing device, contacting the resin with oxygen in an amount of at least 40 ppm by weight resin, and contacting the resin with a primary antioxidant, wherein the antioxidant-contacting step is carried out downstream of the oxygen-contacting step.

Application/Control Number: 10/612,747

Art Unit: 1713

Piana exemplifies polyethylene film made from homopolyethylene that has been mixed with additives and contacted with defined volumes of oxygen in the feed hopper of an extruder during pelletization. See Example 1 in column 8. Further, from Table 1 (col. 9) it is apparent the additives include long-term, or primary, antioxidants (i.e., Irganox 1010 and 1076). Thus, like the instantly claimed products, Piana's pelletized resin and resultant film comprise oxygen-treated polyethylene resin comprising a primary antioxidant.

As to claims, 38-39 and 50-51, Mack et al describe a polyethylene film composition characterized by a broad, bimodal molecular weight distribution, a ratio Mw/Mn >/= 15 and a preferred density range of 0.940 to 0.970 g/cc (col. 4, lines 17+), these properties corresponding to those of applicants' polyethylene resin (cf., specification at [0013]-[0015]). The patentees' film-forming material is a linear ethylene copolymer that was blended with additives including a primary antioxidant (Irganox 1010; see col. 5, lines 10-20) and contacted with various amounts of oxygen in the feed hopper of an extruder (*Id.*, lines 24-30). Thus, like the products of claims 38-39 and 50-51, the ethylene copolymer and film of Mack et al comprise oxygen-treated polyethylene resin admixed with a primary antioxidant.

While examiner notes the prior art products were made by a different process to applicants', there is no objective evidence of record relating any preparational difference (e.g., different order of contacting polyethylene with oxygen and primary antioxidant) to an actual and unobvious difference in the ultimate products, compared to the reference products (polyethylene resin and film). Where, as here, a product-by-process claim is

Application/Control Number: 10/612,747

Art Unit: 1713

rejected over a prior art product that appears to be identical, although produced by a different process, the burden properly shifts to applicants to come forward with evidence establishing an unobvious difference between the claimed product and the prior art product. *In re Marosi*, 218 USPQ 195 (Fed. Cir. 1983). This is especially true given the lesser burden of proof on the Office in making out a case of *prima facie* obviousness for product-by-process claims, because of their peculiar nature (M.P.E.P. 2113).

Claims 1-13, 16-37 and 40-49 are allowable over the prior art of record.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: Claim 1 is drawn to a process for oxygen-tailoring or extruding polyethylene resin, which includes the steps of (a) conveying polyethylene resin in a downstream direction through a feed zone, a melt-mixing zone downstream of the feed zone and a melt zone downstream of the melt-mixing zone; (b) contacting the resin with at least 40 ppm O_2 per weight resin and (c) contacting the resin with primary antioxidant, wherein step (c) is carried out downstream of step (b). Independent claims 16 and 40 are correspondingly limited as to contacting order and minimum concentration of O_2 . Examiner has not found a process employing the claimed contacting sequence with the requisite ppm (wt) O_2 to be disclosed or fairly suggested in the prior art.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Examiner F. M. Teskin whose telephone number is (571) 272-1116. The examiner can normally be

Art Unit: 1713

reached on Monday through Thursday from 7:00 AM - 4:30 PM, and can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wu, can be reached on (571) 272-1114. The appropriate fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

FRED TESKIN
PRIMARY EXAMINED

FMTeskin/09-28-04